



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,357	02/08/2001	Dwip N. Banerjee	AUS9-2000-0928-US1	5782

7590

03/25/2004

Volel Emile
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
Internal Zip 4054, 11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/779,357

Applicant(s)

BANERJEE ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application filed 02/08/2001
2. Claims 1-39 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 14 and 27 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-2, 6-15, 19-28, and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over Adar et al. US Patent No. 6,493,702 B1 issued 12/10/2002 filed 05/05/1999 (hereinafter '702).**

In regard to independent claim 14, "*In a web communication network... comprising: determining a weight for each of said plurality of embedded hyperlinks, prioritizing said plurality of embedded hyperlinks based upon said weights* " is taught in '702 col. 16, lines 40-45 (i.e. 'The relative weights of the context match, link structure,

Art Unit: 2176

popularity, frequency, recency, and any other metrics in the ranking operation are matters of preference, and in a preferred embodiment of the invention, can be adjusted by the user. In an alternative embodiment of the invention, the weights are dynamic and adjustable by the system based on user habits...) also "*visually distinguishing said plurality of embedded hyperlinks from each other based upon said prioritizing, whereby said user may select said hyperlinks based upon said prioritizing*" is taught in '702 col. 16, lines 34-53 (i.e. '...The results are then ranked (step 1570) according to the user's selected ...).

In regard to dependent claim 15, "*selectively highlighting a set of said plurality of embedded hyperlinks*" is taught in '702 col. 9, lines 40-45.

In regard to dependent claims 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 14, and therefore is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 21, and 22, "*the frequency with which the linked hypertext document is universally accessed from the Web*", "*the notoriety of the linked hypertext document*" is taught in '702 col. 14, lines 60-65.

In regard to dependent claims 23, and 24 are directed to a web browser for performing the method of claim 14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 25 directed to a web browser for performing the method of claim 15, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 26, "*prefetching from the Web hypertext documents respectively linked to said set of embedded hyperlinks prior to a user*

selection of any of said set of hyperlinks " is taught in '702 col. 15, lines 1-22 (i.e. '... Linked Collection of Documents ...').

In regard to independent claim 19, " *wherein said step of selectively highlighting said set of hyperlinks includes only activating said set of hyperlinks* " is taught in '702 col. 1, lines 40-54 (i.e. '..."Hotlinking" allows a user to navigate between documents on the Web simply by selecting an item of interest within a page...').

In regard to independent claims 1, and 27 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 2, and 28 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 15, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 6, and 32 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 19, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 7, and 33 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 20, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 8, and 34 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 21, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 9, and 35 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 22, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 10, and 36 are directed to a web communication network system with a web search engine and a computer program including a web search program for performing the method of claim 23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 11, and 37 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer program with a web browser program for performing the method of claim 24, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 12, and 38 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer program with a web browser program for performing the method of claim 25, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 13, and 39 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer program with a web browser program for performing the method of claim 26, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2176

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 3-5, 16-18, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adar et al. US Patent No. 6,493,702 B1 issued 12/10/2002 filed 05/05/1999 (hereinafter '702), in view of Becker et al. US No. 5,878,223 issued 03/02/1999 filed 05/07/1997 (hereinafter '223).**

In regard to dependent claims 16-18, **'702 does not explicitly teaches, "varying the brightness of said set of hyperlinks", "varying the color of said set of hyperlinks" "blinking said set of hyperlinks"** however **'223 teaches, ... chance color... size, blinking, font, intensity..., see '223 col.6, lines 25-63.**

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of **'702** with **'223**. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to include the varying of brightness, varying the color, and blinking of hyperlinks to the method of the web communication network. **In this way, the user of the requesting computer can navigate the information network, requesting pages as desired**, is taught in **'223 col. 1, lines 53-55; and also, This change in graphical characteristic 343 is useful so that users will know which links will be quick to display and which will take longer time**, also is taught in **'223 col. 6, lines 40-43.**

In regard to dependent claims **3-5, and 29-31** are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claims 16-18, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mandeberg et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,038,545 issued 03/14/2000 filed 03/17/1997

Bozdagi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,647,535B1 issued 11/11/2003 filed 03/18/1999


Kobayashi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,654,742B1 issued 11/25/2003 filed 12/14/2000

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
March 17, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER